

Message

From: Moler, Robert [Moler.Robert@epa.gov]
Sent: 8/10/2017 8:12:08 PM
To: Nichols, Terri [terri.nichols@umconnect.umd.edu]
CC: Sparks, Sara [sparks.sara@epa.gov]; Vranka, Joe [vranka.joe@epa.gov]; Jennifer.harrington@umontana.edu; chris@clarkfork.org; jeri@centric.net; Elizabeth Oleson [olesonea@onewest.net]; Harrison, Jennifer [Harrison.Jennifer@epa.gov]; chjsbny@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: Frenchtown (Smurfit-Stone) CAG Questions
Attachments: Smurfit-email-communityGroups-20170713.pdf

Hi Terri,

I was in the office for a few hours today and wanted to make a quick follow up to your inquiry before I take off again. Thanks for your message. We can follow up further at the next CAG meeting as I will be out of the office again for a few weeks.

I am CC'ing the CAG admin team since these are appropriate questions and issues for CAG discussion.

Sara's response is accurate. I'll add a few other points to clarify.

In the future, I recommend that questions like these be shared with the CAG group at monthly meetings. Several members of the CAG have experiences that would add value to responding to these questions and I think everyone, myself included, would benefit from the discussion. We meet regularly and this is good information for the CAG to discuss in open forum rather than behind the scenes. Thanks again for raising these questions.

Your questions are below and my additions to Sara's responses are in blue. I hope this helps. Thanks!

1. At the August 3 CAG meeting in Frenchtown, Robert mentioned that this is the only "bonafide" CAG in Montana. Yet the EPA site lists four others: in Columbia Falls, Libby, Milltown, and the Silverbow/Butte Area. Robert also previously sent me the mission statement for what I thought was an Anaconda CAG. Can you explain this discrepancy, or what Robert might've meant by this?
 1. Sara's response is accurate about the distinction between a community advisory group (CAG) and a group that is a recipient of a technical advisory grant (TAG).
 2. It looks like we need to update the [EPA site](#) that lists CAGs for Montana since the some of that information is out of date – thanks for bringing that to my attention. I see that the Smurfit site CAG is not mentioned and that two of the groups listed are no longer active as CAGs. Good to know.
 3. A clarification – The Smurfit CAG is the only bonafide CAG in the sites *where I serve as a Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC)*. Sorry for the misunderstanding, I should have made that clear. Although I serve on most of the sites in Montana, Jennifer Harrison is the CIC for the sites in Libby MT. I believe they do have a CAG there as well. You can visit the [EPA website](#) for Libby and I have CC'ed Jennifer Harrison on this response. (303) 312-6813; harrison.jennifer@epa.gov. You may want to follow up with her.
 4. The Milltown project and CAG activity was before my time.
 1. To my knowledge the specific CAG for the Milltown project "Milltown Redevelopment Working Group" is no longer active because much of the work there has concluded.
 2. You may also want to reach out to Peter N., Mary Price, and others who have historic experience with the Milltown CAG.
 3. There is a Clark Fork River Technical Assistance Committee that may also be of interest to you. <http://www.cfrtac.org/whatiscfrtac.html>.

5. The Superfund site near Columbia Falls has a group, the CFAC Community Liaison Panel, that is very similar to a CAG because diverse stakeholder groups and members of the community are involved and engage in the Superfund process. However, it is organized by a communication firm hired by the potentially responsible party. This differs from a CAG that is community organized.
 6. Like Sara explained, the Anaconda Smelter site, Silver Bow Creek Butte Area site, and also the ACM Smelter and Refinery site, have non-profit organizations that have applied for and received a technical assistant grant (TAG). Groups that receive a TAG may function in a similar advisory role and share other similarities as a CAG but have different guidelines. However, it is not a far reach to consider groups like them and the CFAC CLP, as de facto CAGs.
2. Is it possible to get a copy of the mission statements for the Libby, Milltown, and Silverbow/Butte Area CAGs? Robert previously sent me mission statements for CAGs in Anaconda and Columbia Falls, but not for these others.
 1. Please see above for links/contacts for the Libby site and information about Milltown site. I am not aware of their mission statements.
 2. I included the mission statement the Citizens Technical Env. Committee (CTEC) that is the TAG recipient for the Silver Bow Creek Butte Area Superfund site in the email I sent to you previously. I've attached that with the links for your and the CAG admin team's reference.
 3. Another community group in Butte that may be of interest to you is the Restore Our Creek Coalition, (CTEC is represented in that group as well). They also represent diverse stakeholder and community groups and are active in the Superfund process. <http://www.restoreourcreek.org/>
 3. Do you know why it took so long to establish a CAG in Frenchtown? I know the EPA has been involved there since 2011, yet an initial CAG informational meeting was only held in March of this year.
 1. A CAG is formed by the community and the CAG for the Smurfit-Stone Mill site would best source to respond to this question.
 2. Prior to the CAG forming, the West Valley Community Council was (and is still) active in keeping the EPA and Superfund issues on their agenda so that the community could be informed and ask questions.
 3. CAG information and links have been available prior to the 3/17 meeting and the WVCC asked for a formal presentation about forming a CAG at their meeting 2/9/2017. The 3/2017 meeting was a follow up to that presentation and was requested by the community.
 4. Finally, Robert also mentioned that this clean-up effort is slightly unusual in that the EPA has allowed Missoula County and other interested stakeholders to review and comment on some work plans and other documents during the testing process, and this is not the case at most Superfund sites. Is this true? If so, why is Missoula different? Why has this community gotten more input on testing, and why do other communities not get such input?
 1. One of the benefits of community involvement is that it can influence the Superfund process so that specific local concerns and preferences are considered and addressed. The informal stakeholder review process for certain draft documents was started at the Smurfit-Stone Mill site because several community stakeholders emphasized the preference to review technical documents related to the site. Sara Sparks, in her management of the Site, encourages input from stakeholders on technical documents based on this expressed involvement preference. She set a specific time for comments to be sensitive to another community concern that the investigation and cleanup is taking too long and should be expedited.
 2. All Superfund sites are different depending on the nature of contamination, concerns of the community, what stage in the Superfund process is happening at the site, etc. This can mean different approaches to community involvement for different communities. Outreach strategies may also need to be changed/updated over time as changes in the Superfund process occur, site conditions change, and the concerns and preferences of the community evolve. Community

involvement is designed to be dynamic process to meet the needs of specific communities, not a cookie-cutter approach.

3. For clarification, other sites do have stakeholder groups and people who review technical documents and are involved in the Superfund process but the procedures and methods can differ depending on the unique conditions of each site.

Robert Moler
Community Involvement Coordinator
EPA – Montana
406.457.5032

From: Sparks, Sara
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 8:05 AM
To: Nichols, Terri <terri.nichols@umconnect.umd.edu>
Cc: Moler, Robert <Moler.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Frenchtown (Smurfit-Stone) CAG Questions

Terri: I am sending you an EPA web page that will help explain the difference between CAGs and TAGs. I hope this will help clarify the differences. Sara

<https://www.epa.gov/superfund/technical-assistance-communities>

From: Nichols, Terri [<mailto:terri.nichols@umconnect.umd.edu>]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 7:42 AM
To: Sparks, Sara <sparks.sara@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Frenchtown (Smurfit-Stone) CAG Questions

Thanks, Sara, I appreciate your trying to answer, but you're right, Robert is probably the best person to answer. I may just have to wait until he returns.

Terri

On Aug 10, 2017, at 7:33 AM, Sparks, Sara <sparks.sara@epa.gov> wrote:

Terri: I did not want to speak for Robert and I was hoping he would check his emails. I believe there are TAGs (Technical Advisory Groups) at these other sites. I know we have a TAG in Butte or the Silver Bow Creek/Butte Area Superfund site. So that is the difference. Technical Advisory Groups vs. Community Advisory Groups. These groups begin when the community wants to begin them. Frenchtown has recently started their CAG. As a project officer, I believe it is important to have community involvement. Hope this answers your questions. Sara

From: Nichols, Terri [<mailto:terri.nichols@umconnect.umd.edu>]
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 5:42 AM
To: Sparks, Sara <sparks.sara@epa.gov>
Cc: Moler, Robert <Moler.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Frenchtown (Smurfit-Stone) CAG Questions

Hi Sara,

I'd e-mailed you and Joe because Robert's voicemail said he'll be out of the office through September 5. Is Robert the only person who can answer these questions?

Thank you both!
Terri

On Aug 8, 2017, at 10:45 AM, Sparks, Sara <sparks.sara@epa.gov> wrote:

Robert: If you have time, please look at Terri's questions and give me a call when you have time so we can put a response together. Sara

From: Nichols, Terri [<mailto:terri.nichols@umconnect.umt.edu>]

Sent: Tuesday, August 08, 2017 10:32 AM

To: Vranka, Joe <vranka.joe@epa.gov>; Sparks, Sara <sparks.sara@epa.gov>

Subject: Frenchtown (Smurfit-Stone) CAG Questions

Hi Joe and Sara,

Directing these questions to you because Robert is out of the office for the next month. I'm a graduate student at the University of Montana who's studying the Frenchtown CAG as it forms and establishes its goals and missions.

1. At the August 3 CAG meeting in Frenchtown, Robert mentioned that this is the only "bonafide" CAG in Montana. Yet the EPA site lists four others: in Columbia Falls, Libby, Milltown, and the Silverbow/Butte Area. Robert also previously sent me the mission statement for what I thought was an Anaconda CAG. Can you explain this discrepancy, or what Robert might've meant by this?
2. Is it possible to get a copy of the mission statements for the Libby, Milltown, and Silverbow/Butte Area CAGs? Robert previously sent me mission statements for CAGs in Anaconda and Columbia Falls, but not for these others.
3. Do you know why it took so long to establish a CAG in Frenchtown? I know the EPA has been involved there since 2011, yet an initial CAG informational meeting was only held in March of this year.
4. Finally, Robert also mentioned that this clean-up effort is slightly unusual in that the EPA has allowed Missoula County and other interested stakeholders to review and comment on some work plans and other documents during the testing process, and this is not the case at most Superfund sites. Is this true? If so, why is Missoula different? Why has this community gotten more input on testing, and why do other communities not get such input?

Thank you for your time,
Terri

Terri Nichols
MS Student, Environmental Studies
University of Montana

Climate Smart Missoula Summer Smart Intern
(406) 250-8263
terri.nichols@umontana.edu
terrifnichols@gmail.com